

REMARKS

Claims 9, 12-13, 15-19 remain in this application. Claims 1-8, 10-11, 14, and 20-21 are now canceled. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

The objections set forth in sections 2 and 3 on page 2 of the Office Action are moot, since claim 14 is canceled.

Independent claim 9 is rejected, along with dependent claims 10 and 15, as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,464,298 to Hänsel et al. Claim 9 above incorporates limitations previously appearing in claim 11, however, as well as additional limitations. As claim 11 was not rejected based on the Hänsel et al. patent, the rejection of claim 9 based on the Hänsel et al. patent is now moot.

Independent claim 9, independent claim 17, and various dependent claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by, or 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over, French patent publication 2780689 to Cantin et al. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim 9 above incorporates limitations previously appearing in claim 10, as well as additional limitations. As claim 10 was not rejected based on the Cantin et al. publication, the rejection of claim 9 based on the Cantin et al. patent is now moot.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 17 based on the Cantin et al. publication is respectfully requested. It is apparent, even without an English translation of the Cantin et al. publication, that the Cantin et al. movable frame 20 has been improperly characterized by the Examiner as a “piston,” the Cantin et al. fixed frame 14 has been improperly characterized by the Examiner as a “cylinder,” and the gap between parallel vertical plates 15, 16 of the Cantin et al.

arrangement has been improperly characterized by the Examiner as an “opening provided in a cylinder wall.” These features, which are required by claim 17 above, are not found in the Cantin et al. arrangement, and the anticipation rejection of claim 17 should be withdrawn. Nothing noted by the Examiner, moreover, suggests modifying the Cantin et al. arrangement so as to include these features, moreover, and it is submitted that claim 17 above is patentable.

Both independent claim 9 and independent claim 17 above should be patentable for reasons discussed. All other claims remaining in this application are dependent claims, and should also be patentable.

This application should now be allowable. If there are any questions regarding this Reply or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an extension of time sufficient to effect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #095309.58147US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 7, 2008

/Richard R. Diefendorf/  
Richard R. Diefendorf  
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
RRD:rd